DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 120 SP 010 649

AUTHOR Elsmere, Robert T.; Daunt, Patrick D.
TITLE Effects of the Size of the Student Teacher Group on the Supervisory Program.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; *College Supervisors; Comparative Testing; Control Groups; Cooperating Teachers; Group Experience; *Hypothesis Testing; Observation; *Preservice Education; Research Methodology; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS Ball State University

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to test the following hypothesis: no significant differences will exist in the responses to a questionnaire by student teachers and supervising teachers assigned to two different programs of student teaching--one large group and two small groups. The control program was the normal program of supervision that is typically employed by the college supervisor. The experimental program involved a considerably larger number of student teachers under the supervision of one college supervisor. The college supervisor utilized special approaches with the experimental supervising teachers and student teachers to make accommodations for the large number of students. An evaluative questionnaire was administered to the student teachers and supervising teachers at the end of the quarter. It was found that the large-group program was affected to some extent by the lack of classroom observations by the college supervisor, especially in his ability to evaluate and write recommendations. However, the progress of the student teacher did not appear to be influenced by the type of supervisory program, and both college supervisors were rated highly. It was concluded that teachers and students seemed to respond to the expectations of the particular supervisory program and accept the approach provided. The hypothesis was rejected. Tables illustrate methods of comparison of groups and means of scoring and evaluation. Appendixes give examples of final questionnaires given to the participants in the program.
(Author/JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132120

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EFFECTS OF THE SIZE OF THE STUDENT TEACHER GROUP ON THE SUPERVISORY PROGRAM

by

Dr. Robert T. Elsmere

and

Dr. Patrick D. Daunt

Department of
Secondary, Higher, and Foundations of Education
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana
1973-74

SP010 649

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Table of Contents	ii
	List of Tables	iii
I	The Problem	1
	Introduction	1
	Statement of Problem and Procedures	1
	The Major Hypothesis	2
	The Two Programs of Supervision	2
	The Student and Teacher Population	6
	Sizes of Experimental and Control Groups	6
	The College Supervisors	7
	The Measuring Instruments	7
	Collecting the Data	8
	Limitations and Delimitations	9
II	The Control Groups	10
	Introduction	10
	Comparing the Control Groups	10
	The Minor Hypothesis	10
	Findings	11
	Conclusions	12
III	Procedures for Testing the Major Hypothesis and Reporting Results	13
	Introduction	13
	Procedure	13
IV	Findings and Conclusions	15
	Rejecting the Major Hypothesis	15
	The Supervisory Process, Contacts and Availability of the College Supervisor	16
	The Supervisory Process, Classroom Visits and Observation	18
	The Supervisory Process Conferences	19
	The Supervisory Process, Planning and Teaching Methods	21
	Evaluation and Grading of Student Teaching Performance	22
	College Supervisor Competency	24
V	Summary	26
Appendixes		
A,	Teacher Questionnaire	iv
B,	Student Questionnaire	v

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparison of Program Elements.	4
2	Size of Experimental and Control Groups . .	6
3	Mean Scores and "t" Scores of Teacher Control Groups	11
4	Mean Scores and "t" Scores of Student Control Groups	12
6	The Supervisory Process, Contact and Availability of College Supervisor. . . .	16
7	The Supervisory Process, Classroom Visits and Observation.	18
8	The Supervisory Process, Conferences. . . .	20
9	The Supervisory Process, Planning and Teaching Methods	21
10	Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance.	23
11	College Supervisor Competency	25

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This study examined two programs of student teaching supervision. The objective was to draw some conclusions about the effects of the size of the student teacher group on the supervisory program. The major difference between the two programs was in the number of student teachers assigned.

Many questions naturally apply to programs of student teaching. "Can a college supervisor handle an increased number of student teachers?" "If we increase the number of students, can we still maintain an adequate program?" "At what point does a college supervisor become inneffective?" "Is there a point where the number of student teachers assigned to the program seriously impairs the effectiveness of that program?"

These are difficult questions hinging upon each person's own philosophy and definition of what constitutes an "adequate" or "quality" program of supervision. Nevertheless, this study is an initial effort to examine these and similar questions in an objective approach based upon planned research.

Statement of the Problem and Procedures

The Problem

If we compare a program of student teaching in which a college supervisor is assigned 16-20 student teachers (control group) with another program of student teaching in which a college supervisor is assigned 30 or more student teachers (experimental group), will differences occur between the two programs as perceived by the student teacher and the supervising teacher?

The Major Hypothesis

To test for these differences the following null hypothesis was designed.

No significant differences will exist in the responses to a questionnaire by student teachers and supervising teachers assigned to two different programs of student teaching, one large group and two small groups.

The Two Programs of Supervision

The two programs of supervisions (experimental and control) were developed to contain as many similar elements as possible. The major variable was the number of student teachers assigned to each program. This necessitated some re-designing of the role of the college supervisor in the experimental program to compensate for the reduced number of school visits possible due to the increase in the number of student teachers he was supervising.

The role of the experimental college supervisor became that of a "trouble-shooter" with more responsibility for "observation" and "evaluation" of the student teacher being placed on the supervising teacher. An additional two-week "Progress Report" from the supervising teacher to the college supervisor was added to help the college supervisor in early identification of problems.

An additional supervising teachers meeting was incorporated into the experimental program as another means of improving contact. In addition, there was a greater "clustering" of from 2 to 5 student teachers in a single school in the experimental program to improve accessibility and contacts. Also the supervising teachers and student teachers were provided with an "information" handbook which attempted to clarify the roles of each person involved in the supervisory team. This handbook included tearout progress report forms that were completed and sent to the college supervisor periodically

during the quarter.

The college supervisors of the control groups placed their program emphasis on more frequent and intensive classroom visits and observations. Other areas of the control programs were the same as the experimental one. Table 1 shows at a glance the similarities and cifferences in the two programs.

TABLE 1 COMPARISON OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS OF THE STUDENT TEACHING RESEARCH PROJECT

PROGRAM ELEMENTS	Experimental Group A	Control Groups B & C
Group Contacts		
1. College Supervisor has beginning of term seminar with student teachers	X	X
2. College Supervisor has Progress Seminar with student teachers (3rd week)	X	X
3. College Supervisor has Mid-term In-service meeting with supervising teachers	X	X
4. College Supervisor has Progress Seminar with student teachers (7th week)	X	X
5. College Supervisor has Final End-of-Term meeting with student teachers	X	X
6. College Supervisor has Final Group "Evaluation of Student Teachers" session with Supervising Teachers	X	
Written Reports		
7. A two-week "Report on Progress" from Supervising Teacher to College Supervisor	X	
8. A Mid-term evaluation on Student Teacher progress from Supervising Teacher to College Supervisor	X	X
9. A Final evaluation on Student Teacher progress from Supervising Teacher to College Supervisor	X	X
Student Placement		
10. "Clustering" of 2 to 5 students in a single school for easy access and small group meetings.	X	

TABLE 1 (CONT'D)

PROGRAM ELEMENTS	Experimental Group A	Control Groups B & C
College Supervisor Visits		
11. Initial "Orientation visit" by College Supervisor with Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher	X	X
12. Two to Five "Intensive Observation" visits by College Supervisor with each Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher		X
13. One or more "Intensive Observation" visits by College Supervisor with Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher only where problems are indicated[1]	X[1]	
14. One "Minimum Observation" visit by College Supervisor with Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher where no problem exists and if time permits[2]	X[2]	
15. One "Closure" or "Final Evaluation" visit by College Supervisor with each Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher		X
16. Providing Supervising Teachers with an "Information" Handbook	X	

[1]There were 5 student teachers out of 31 requiring intensive observation visits. Three received two visits each, one received three visits, and one received six visits.

[2]Of the remaining student teachers (not including the above five) twenty received a "minimum observation" visit. Six students did not receive a "minimum observation" visit since time did not permit it.

The Student and Teacher Population

The student teacher populations were those students normally assigned to the geographic areas of the two college supervisors. The students involved were assigned in 11 counties of Indiana located in the Northern part of the state. The sample included all of those student teachers assigned to that particular supervisor in the quarter.[3] This sample represented a cross-section of the student teacher population of Ball State University.[4]

The supervising teachers were those who were assigned these student teachers in the normal placement procedure. The ages, experience, degrees, and teaching areas were wide and varied and represented a broad spectrum of these variables. The placement of these student teachers and the assignment to teachers was made with no prior knowledge of the areas to be selected for the experimental program. Random sampling is not claimed for either the experimental or control groups, but in the groups selected, all subjects were included.

Sizes of Experimental and Control Groups

There were 31 supervising teachers (A_1)[5] and 31 student teachers (A_2) in the experimental program. There were 19 supervising teachers (B_1) and 17 student teachers (B_2) in one control group and 19 supervising teachers (C_1) and 20 student teachers (C_2) in the other control group.

TABLE 2 SIZE AND QUARTER OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Quarter	College Spvsr.	Group	Teachers	Code	Students	Code
Fall '73	X	Experimental (A)	N=31	A_1[5]	N=31	A_2
Fall '73	Y	Control (B)	N=19	B_1	N=17	B_2
Winter '73-'74	X	Control (C)	N=19	C_1	N=20	C_2

[3]All quarters are 10 weeks in length ranging from 48 to 50 school days.

[4]The population included elementary, secondary, male and female, large urban schools, smaller rural schools, schools in small to medium sized towns or cities.

[5]The letter refers to the experimental or control group, the number for teacher or student group. See table 2 for clarification.

The College Supervisors

Two different college supervisors (Designated X and Y, See Table 2) were assigned to the groups. Supervisor X conducted the fall program with the large experimental group of teachers and students and also conducted one of the control programs during the winter quarter immediately following the fall program. Supervisor Y conducted the fall quarter control program or in the same fall quarter as the experimental program.

The above design solved two problem variables. It would place a check against any undue bias of one program over the other which could occur if only one college supervisor was assigned to both programs. It also provides an indication of the effects that two different college supervisors might have on the data.

The Measuring Instruments

The Office of Student Teaching at Ball State University already employed two end-of-quarter surveys or questionnaires for obtaining program data from supervising teachers[6] and student teachers.[7] These questionnaires were used but with the inclusion of additional items for measuring specific aspects of the experimental and control programs (Appendixes A and B).

A "semantic differential"[8] was employed to obtain mean scores on each item in the student and teacher questionnaires. This made it possible to compare the means and examine the variability of the groups.

Specific items were somewhat identical and were also stated negatively as a check on the validity of the questionnaires. Since the questions ask for specific opinions about aspects of the program, content validity is claimed in part.

---

6 Teacher Questionnaire developed by Tom McEwin of Teachers College Faculty at Ball State University.

7 Student Questionnaire developed over a three year period (1971-1974) by Edwin P. Prettyman and James M. McClure of Teachers College Faculty at Ball State University. It was partially supported by a University grant.

8 Agree=5; Probably Agree=4; Uncertain/Not Applicable=3; Probably Disagree=2; Disagree=1.

In two analyses of groups of items, the responses of the three groups, A, B, and C yielded reliability coefficients of .9531 and .9265. The two questionnaires were considered highly reliable instruments and adequate to the purposes of this study.

Collecting the Data

The data was obtained by administering the teacher questionnaire (Appendix A) to all of the supervising teachers in the experimental and control groups and administering the student questionnaire (Appendix B) to all of the student teachers in the experimental and control groups. Administration of all questionnaires was accomplished during the tenth and final week of the quarter.

The student teachers completed the questionnaires in the final group meetings held on the last day of the quarter. Each teacher mailed the completed questionnaire on the last day of the quarter.

The experimental group of 31 teachers (A_1) and 31 students (A_2) all completed questionnaires for a 100 percent return by the experimental group. The 19 teachers (B_1) and 17 students (B_2) of the fall quarter control group all completed questionnaires for a 100 percent return. There were two more teachers than students in this group because two student teachers were assigned to two supervising teachers. One teacher of the 20 in the second control group (C_1) failed to complete and return a questionnaire which made for only a 95 percent return. All 20 of the students of the second control group (C_2) completed questionnaires for a return of 100 percent.

The responses of each subject on each questionnaire were then punched on computer cards for data processing. Reliability coefficients were obtained on the questionnaire items. Means, standard deviations, and measures of variability or "t" scores were produced for testing the major hypothesis.

The variability between the two control groups and the experimental and control groups and the testing for the major and minor[9] hypotheses was measured using the "t" ratio. The "t" ratio compared the differences between the group means and the apparent effect of the treatment with the standard error of the differences between the means. This produces a measure of the variability of the differences and an estimate of error. Using the two-tailed test for "t" the researchers were able to determine if significant differences existed between the two control groups and the experimental and control groups in the responses to the questionnaire items. A test of significance was imposed at the .05 level for acceptance or rejection of the two control groups as a single population and for acceptance or rejection of the major hypothesis.

Limitations and Delimitations

The student teaching quarter was limited to 10 weeks, the normal University schedule. The study was limited to two consecutive quarters in the fall and winter of 1973-74. A Spring quarter was not included.

The effects of two college supervisors may influence the data, but there is greater validity achieved in this design than if only one college supervisor was assigned to both programs.

There is the recognition that any questionnaire has its limitations.

The student sample involved only Ball State student teachers in a particular geographic area. We can but infer that conclusions may be applicable to the total student teaching program. Inferences about other student teaching programs in other institutions may be limited.

---

[9] The Minor Hypothesis for testing the variability of the two control groups is a necessary prerequisite for testing the Major Hypothesis. The minor hypothesis is presented in Chapter Two.

CHAPTER II

THE CONTROL GROUPS

Introduction

The selection of two control groups under the direction of two different college supervisors (1) provides a control group of teachers and students at least as large as the experimental groups and (2) overcomes bias inherent in a design when only one person is in charge of both the experimental and control environments. An additional benefit is the examination of responses in two different quarters, fall and winter.

The two college supervisors, X and Y, conducted their respective fall and winter control programs in a similar manner. Both supervisors used identical group meeting times, the same evaluation and reporting forms, and provided the similar "intensive observation" visits to their respective groups. There was the same emphasis on the individual conferences with the student teachers and supervising teachers during each school visit. The two college supervisors kept in constant communication during the two control group programs so that they could keep all the program elements similar as outlined in Table 1.

Comparing the Control Groups

The Minor Hypothesis

to test whether or not the two control groups yielded similar results and were similar or identical populations the following hypothesis was designed:

> When two different college supervisors in two different quarters conduct identical small group student teacher programs, similar in scope and design, then; similar responses to questionnaire items will be elicited from the teacher and student populations and there will be no significant differences between the two groups in their responses.

TABLE 3 MEAN SCORES AND "t" SCORES OF TEACHER CONTROL GROUPS B_1 AND C_1*

Item No.	Means of Control Group B_1	Means of Control Group C_1	"t" score	Item No.	Means of Control Group B_1	Means of Control Group C_1	"t" score
1	3.895	4.368	1.543	21	4.947	4.737	1.512
2	4.368	4.421	0.148	22	1.211	1.053	0.728
3	4.789	4.737	0.296	23	4.895	4.842	0.387
4	4.842	4.579	1.457	24	4.474	4.316	0.402
5	4.421	4.474	0.234	25	4.368	4.684	0.856
6	4.842	4.737	0.781	26	4.362	4.789	0.577
7	4.579	4.842	0.970	27	4.895	4.842	0.387
8	4.421	4.421	0.000	28	4.895	4.842	0.387
9	1.316	1.263	0.245	29	5.000	4.895	1.000
10	4.474	4.684	1.182	30	5.000	4.947	1.000
11	4.474	4.737	0.985	31	4.632	4.842	0.851
12	4.211	3.684	1.387	32	4.789	4.368	1.760
13	3.895	3.789	0.290	33	4.000	3.684	0.753
14	4.947	4.632	1.732	34	3.316	2.684	1.414
15	4.597	4.684	0.330	35	2.053	2.579	1.588
16	4.632	4.368	0.976	36	3.526	4.000	1.042
17	4.684	4.579	0.330	37	2.579	3.316	1.620
18	4.632	4.684	0.239	38	4.526	4.263	1.028
19	4.579	4.684	0.351	39	4.158	4.316	0.428
20	4.789	4.632	0.943	40	4.737	4.474	1.201

* Teacher Group B_1 (N = 19) Teacher Group C_1 (N = 19) Total N = 38; 36 degrees of freedom requires a "t" score of $\pm$ 2.03 at .05 level for significant difference.

Findings

Tables 3 and 4 outline the data received from the processing of the data for the two control groups. The tables show the mean scores on each item, the results on both control groups of students and teachers, and the "t" scores obtained for comparing the variability of the control groups and for testing the minor hypothesis.

The requirement of a "t" score in either group of $\pm$ 2.03 for significant differences to occur was not met. All "t" scores on all items were less than this.

TABLE 4 MEAN SCORES AND "t" SCORES OF STUDENT CONTROL GROUPS B_2 AND C_2*

Item No.	Means of Control Group B_2	Means of Control Group C_2	"t" Score	Item No.	Means of Control Group B_2	Means of Control Group C_2	"t" Score
1	3.824	3.850	0.056	24	4.118	3.950	0.440
2	4.588	4.800	1.129	25	4.235	4.350	0.392
3	5.000	4.900	1.337	26	4.706	4.800	0.515
4	4.647	4.700	0.193	27	4.529	4.500	0.098
5	4.176	4.500	0.948	28	4.412	4.850	1.729
6	4.176	3.750	1.079	29	4.529	4.750	0.808
7	4.529	4.850	1.261	30	4.353	4.500	0.394
8	1.647	1.700	0.143	31	4.588	4.700	0.353
9	3.706	4.000	0.615	32	4.647	4.950	1.828
10	4.471	4.650	0.785	33	3.353	2.800	1.075
11	4.588	4.950	1.486	34	4.647	4.950	1.324
12	4.588	4.700	0.342	35	1.176	1.000	1.087
13	5.000	4.900	1.337	36	3.647	4.150	1.201
14	4.176	4.650	1.947	37	3.941	4.550	1.729
15	4.471	4.750	1.023	38	1.765	2.050	0.696
16	4.706	4.500	0.778	39	3.471	4.150	1.563
17	3.059	2.800	0.599	40	4.000	3.950	0.134
18	3.706	4.050	0.869	41	4.588	4.850	1.319
19	4.647	4.950	1.324	42	3.235	3.250	0.041
20	4.412	4.800	1.534	43	4.353	4.350	0.009
21	1.882	2.550	1.350	44	3.882	4.250	1.000
22	4.588	4.500	0.275	45	4.235	4.300	0.159
23	4.353	4.800	1.541				

*Student Group B_2 (N = 17) Student Group C_2 (N = 20) Total N = 37; 35 degrees of freedom requires a "t" score of $\pm$ 2.03 at .05 level for significant difference.

Conclusions

Since there were no significant differences between the supervising teacher or student teacher control groups, the minor hypothesis was supported. Therefore, the two control groups could be combined and treated as a single population.

It was also concluded that the variables of two different college supervisors and different quarters had no appreciable effect upon the results.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR TESTING THE MAJOR HYPOTHESIS AND REPORTING THE RESULTS

Introduction

In the previous chapter it was established that the teacher control groups (B_1 and C_1) and the two student control groups (B_2 and C_2) could be treated as a single population. It was then possible to compare this combined control population with the respective experimental populations of teachers (A_1) and students (A_2) in a test of the major hypothesis.

Procedure

1. Group means on each item were obtained from both questionnaire responses of students and teachers and two sets of "t" scores were obtained. This made possible an examination of the level of responses to the items and a comparison of the experimental and control groups.

2. All items in the teacher and student questionnaires were combined and placed in nine major categories for analysis. Only categories 1 through 6 are reported in detail. Categories 7 through 9 are peripheral to the study, but are included in the Summary.

(1) The Supervisory Process; Contacts and Availability of the College Supervisor.

(2) The Supervisory Process; Classroom Visits and Observation

(3) The Supervisory Process; Conferences

(4) The Supervisory Process; Planning and Teaching Methods

(5) Evaluation and Grading of Student Teaching Performance

(6) Competency of the College Supervisor

(7) The College Supervisor and Personal Relations

(8) Responses about the Student Teaching Programs

(9) Responses about Student Teaching and Pre-Student Teaching Professional Education Courses

3. The teacher and student items relevant to each category were organized into six tables. The means on each item of student and teacher responses in the control and experimental groups are presented together with the "t" scores which compare the variability between the experimental and control groups on each item.

4. The items in each table where significant differences occurred in the responses of the experimental and control groups are placed first. These are followed in the same table by the items where no significant differences had occurred in the responses between the two groups.

5. Items are organized in each table in a topical sequence rather than numerically for better understanding of results. The item statements within the tables are condensed for easier review and space economy. The full statements on each item are available in the questionnaires in Appendixes A and B.

6. Item statements which are phrased negatively produced low scores. These were changed to positive statements within the tables and the scores converted for easy comparison of results and consistency of reporting.

7. Each major category is reported separately. The findings are not described in detail, but are presented fully in the tables. In this way, redundancy is reduced and brevity is served.

8. The conclusions are reported within each category for easier comparison with the findings presented in the tables.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Rejecting the Major Hypothesis

Findings

Out of 40 items on the teacher questionnaire, significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups of teachers on 14 items or 35 percent of all items. There were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups of teachers on 26 items or 65 percent of all items.[10]

Out of 45 items on the student questionnaire, significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups of students on 20 items or 44.5 percent of all items. There were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups of students on 25 items or 55.5 percent of all items.[10]

Conclusions

The major hypothesis, that "No significant differences will exist in the responses to a questionnaire by student teachers and supervising teachers assigned to two different programs of student teaching, one large group and two small groups" is rejected. This rejection is necessarily limited since a greater number of items produced "no significant differences" and a lesser number of items produced "significant differences" between the groups.

The major findings and conclusions come in the analysis of the items and the kinds of items to which the students and teachers responded rather than in the numerical superiority or percentage of items labeled as significant or not significant.

---

[10] All items and their corresponding "t" scores and the "t" score necessary for a level of significance at the .05 level are reported in the tables.

Findings - Significant Differences

Table 6 includes three teacher items and two student items where significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups. These items deal with the contacts, number of school visits, and availability of the college supervisors.

TABLE 6 THE SUPERVISORY PROCESS, CONTACTS AND AVAILABILITY OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR

Item[12]	Statement	Control Means	Expmtl. Means	"t"[11] Score
T 38	Sufficient contacts with student teacher	4.395	3.710	2.667
T 40	Sufficient contacts with supervising teacher	4.605	4.065	2.235
S 45	Sufficient contacts with student teacher	4.270	3.258	3.292
S 37	Sufficient contacts with supervising teacher	4.270	3.355	3.048
T 32	Sufficient number of school visits	4.579	3.258	4.627
S 4	Availability of the college supervisor	4.452	4.676	0.936
T 2	Availability of the college supervisor	4.395	4.065	1.241

[13] Items above the dotted line are identified as having significant differences, those below the dotted line are identified as not having significant differences.

[11] Teacher Group: N=69, Degrees of freedom 67, "t" score of ± 2.00 required for significant difference at .05 level.
Student Group: N=68, Degrees of freedom 66, "t" score of ± 2.00 required for significant difference at .05 level.

[12] The letter T preceding the item number identifies it as a teacher item. The letter S preceding the item number identifies it as a student item.

NOTE: Above footnotes apply to all subsequent tables.

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 6 includes one student item and one teacher item where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups. Both items dealt with the availability of the college supervisor.

Conclusions

As the number of student teachers assigned to a college supervisor increases, the number of "sustained or intensive contacts" that he can make with the teachers and students decreases.

Student teachers and supervising teachers consider the contacts made by the college supervisor an important factor in the student teaching program.

The students indicate a greater need for these contacts than do the supervising teachers and supervising teachers support this contention.

Supervising teachers reject a supervisory program to some extent where the college supervisor makes less than three school contacts. The student teachers reject a minimal program of visits as presented by the experimental program and want more, not less visits by the college supervisor than even the control program offered.

There appears to be a greater insecurity on the part of the students than evidenced by the teachers and the students apparently want and need continued support from someone from the University. Neither program presented any great problem in the area of availability of the college supervisor to the students or teachers. The experimental program did have an edge in this area as far as the students were concerned. The more favorable response in the experimental program may have been due to the location of the college supervisor in residence in the area. This may also be explained by the frequent contacts made through means other than school visits such as group meetings.

The Supervisory Process, Classroom Visits and Observation

Table 7 includes two teacher items and two student items where significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups. These items dealt mainly with the students' and teachers' perceptions of the value of the classroom visits and observations by the college supervisor.

TABLE 7 THE SUPERVISORY PROCESS, CLASSROOM VISITS AND OBSERVATION

Item	Statement	Control Mean	Expmtl. Mean	"t" Score
S 43	Classroom visits necessary to program	4.351	3.129	4.562
T 39	Competent teacher does not eliminate visits	4.237	3.194	3.225
S 40	Observation necessary for evaluation	3.973	2.935	3.554
T 36	School visits not eliminated by conferences	3.763	2.871	2.445
S 39	Teacher observation only for evaluation	3.645	3.838	.577

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 7 includes one student item relating to classroom observation where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups.

Conclusions

The expectation was that the group of students and teachers receiving fewer classroom visits and observations would have valued this aspect more highly than those in the control program who received more classroom visits and observations. This was not the case in this study.

Observation and classroom visits by the college supervisors are not as important to the program of student teaching as previously believed.

It may be that the college supervisor has been duplicating the role of the supervising teacher and the students are aware of this. Also, students and teachers may be responding more to the expectations placed upon them by the college supervisor, i.e. "It must be important only if the college supervisor thinks it is important." Therefore, the control groups place a higher rating on observation and classroom visits by the college supervisor because of the importance he places on this area.

The increase in the use of conferences and group meetings, the placing of more responsibility on the supervising teacher may be elements which compensate to some degree in the experimental program for the decrease in classroom visits and observations by the college supervisor. In the experimental program it is obvious that a large group of students and teachers can adapt to a program change and accept a different role for the college supervisor.

There is no doubt that the role of the college supervisor needs to be reviewed, particularly in the area of classroom visits and observation, and his experience and expertise placed in better perspective in the total supervisory program.

The Supervisory Process, Conferences

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 8 includes one teacher item and three student items where significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups in the area of conferences with the college supervisor.

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 8 includes four teacher items and two student items where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups. College supervisors in all the groups received very favorable ratings from students and teachers in the way they conducted the conferences and answered questions.

TABLE 8 THE SUPERVISORY PROCESS: CONFERENCES

Item	Statement	Control Means	Expmtl. Means	"t" Score
S 6	Mid-quarter conference benefited student	3.946	3.290	2.328
T 4	Individual meetings along with observation	4.711	3.968	2.761
S 7	Conference with student before observation	4.703	3.903	3.684
S 23	College Supervisor helpful in conferences	4.495	3.355	5.431
T 17	College Supervisor helpful in conferences	4.632	4.452	.796
T 11	Supervisor condid enough to be a help to student	4.605	4.458	.301
T 22	Answered questions specifically and to the point	4.868	4.613	1.586
S 29	Answered questions specifically and to the point	4.613	4.649	0.194
T 23	Could discuss professional problems frandly	4.868	4.710	1.313
S 30	Could discuss progessional problems frankly	4.419	4 .432	.051

Conclusions

Both the students and teachers were satisfied with the abilities of the college supervisors in conducting conferences, in being honest and open, and being helpful when they did confer.

The number of student teachers assigned to a college supervisor does affect the conference situation and as the number of student teachers increases the less helpful these conferences become to the students and teachers. The role of the college supervisor in the area of conferences is diminished by having to work with a greater number of students.

Although observation as previously outlined may not appear to be as important as believed, it may be that the lack of observation has considerable impact upon the poorer rating the experimental program received in the conference category.

Again, the role of the college supervisor needs to be examined. If he cannot obtain the necessary information through classroom observation, he may have to utilize other methods. Perhaps there should be a revision of his present conference role and a transfer of some areas ot it to the supervising teacher.

The Supervisory Process; Planning and Teaching Methods

Findings - Significant Differences

Table 9 includes two student items and one teacher item where significant differences occured between the experimental and control groups in the category of planning and teaching methods.

TABLE 9 THE SUPERVISORY PROCESS: PLANNING AND TEACHING METHODS

Item	Statement	Control Means	Expmtl. Means	"t" Score
S 26	College supervisor provided freedom to plan	4.757	4.258	2.383
S 18	Planning required contributed to teaching	3.892	3.161	2.417
T 6	Familiarity with different teaching methods	4.789	4.290	3.397
S 10	Familiarity with different teaching methods	4.516	4.568	.300
S 16	Student allowed to experiment with methods	4.258	4.595	1.606
T 12	Student encouraged to experiment with methods	3.947	4.290	1.346
T 19	College supervisor provided freedom to plan	4.632	4.742	.571
T 13	Planning required contributed to teaching	3.842	4.161	1.357

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 9 includes three teacher items and two student items where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and the control groups in the category of planning and teaching methods.

Conclusions

The size of the student teaching group does not effect the perception of the college supervisor as a knowledgeable person in the area of teaching methods.

Neither a small group or large group program affects the teachers view of allowing the students freedom to plan. However, the student teachers in the large group appear to feel some restrictions in this area. The key here lies in the difference in the student and teacher responses to the item "the planning required contributed to better teaching". The small groups of students received more direction from the college supervisor than did the large experimental group. This may account for the better rating given by the control group. The teachers rated the experimental program higher (although there was not a significant difference) and this program gave much more responsibility to the supervising teachers.

Students accept more direction in planning, but supervising teachers, as has been suspected, place less value of planning and evidently convey this to the student teachers.

Teachers also view experimentation in different methods by the student teacher with less favor than the college supervisor.

In essence, the size of the student teaching group does not affect the teacher with less favor than the college supervisor.

In essence, the size of the student teaching group does not affect the area of planning and teaching methods as much as the ways in which these areas are perceived by the persons involved and the ways in which the college supervisor can help the supervising teacher assume responsibility in these areas.

Evaluation and Grading of Student Teaching Performance

Findings - Significant Differences

Table 10 includes two teacher items and five student items where significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups in the category dealing with the evaluation and grading of the student teaching performance.

TABLE 10 EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Item	Statement	Control Means	Expmtl. Means	"t" Score
T 20	Supervisors' appraisal of student was fair	4.711	4.355	2.036
S 27	Supervisors' appraisal of student was fair	4.514	3.677	3.796
S 38	Supervisor can evaluate better than teacher	1.919	1.258	2.741
S 42	Teacher can evaluate better than supervisor	4.243	4.742	2.383
T 35	Supervisory approach helped in evaluation	3.684	2.968	2.298
S 36	Supervisory approach helped in evaluation	3.919	2.419	4.899
S 44	Supervisor can write accurate recommendation	4.081	2.677	4.648
S 41	Teacher can write accurate recommendation	4.730	4.677	.342
S 2	Revealing weaknesses did not endanger grade	4.452	4.703	1.449
T 1	Revealing weaknesses did not endanger grade	4.132	4.032	.403

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 10 includes one teacher item and two student items where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups in the category of evaluation and grading of student teaching performance.

Conclusions

Both students and teachers indicate that the college supervisor has the ability to make fair and reasonable evaluations of the student teachers performance but only if the college supervisor has adequate contacts, classroom visits and observations.

The student teachers are much more critical of the role of the college supervisor in the area of evaluation than are the supervising teachers. It appears that the ability of the college supervisor to do an adequate job of evaluation is negatively affected by the assignment of a large group of student teachers. The smaller the group, the more capable is the college supervisor in making adequate evaluations of student teaching performance.

Regardless of the size of the group, the student teachers believe that the supervising teachers can do a much more adequate job of evaluation than can the college supervisors. The kind of supervisory program does not change this view. Both groups of students were critical of both programs as they related to the evaluation of their performance, fair appraisals, and accurate recommendations. Both teachers, college supervisors, and programs were found wanting in the category of evaluation of the student teaching performance. The role of the college supervisor needs to be reviewed. Perhaps it is again the case of duplicating an area which should be given to the supervising teacher. Given an even larger group of student teachers, the college supervisor would no doubt have to rely fully upon the teacher for the evaluation process. At this point, the teacher preparation institutions must realize that it is turning over an important function to the public schools.

College Supervisor Competency

Findings - Significant Differences

Table 11 includes one teacher item and one student item where significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups in their view of the competence of the college supervisor in understanding the elements of the student teaching situation.

Findings - No Significant Differences

Table 11 includes five teacher items and three student items where no significant differences occurred between the experimental and control groups in viewing the competency of the college supervisors.

Both groups of students had confidence in the college supervisors' ability. The control supervisor was rated "very high" and the experimental supervisor was rated "high".

TABLE 11 COLLEGE SUPERVISOR COMPETENCY

Item	Statement	Control Means	Expmtl. Means	"t" Score
S 25	Supervisor understood elements of situation	4.297	3.742	2.360
T 18	Supervisor understood elements of situation	4.658	4.194	2.331
S 12	Confidence in college supervisors' ability	4.774	4.649	.633
T 8	Confidence in college supervisors' ability	4.421	4.613	.847
T 5	Supervisor understood objectives of the school	4.419	4.447	.170
S 20	Understanding of difficulties student faced	4.645	4.622	.131
T 15	Understanding of difficulties student faced	4.632	4.710	.402
S 31	Had realistic view of school problems	4.677	4.432	.153
T 24	Had realistic view of school problems	4.395	4.645	1.057
T 31	Overall rating of college supervisor	4.737	4.677	.334

Conclusions

Both students and teachers see the larger group assignment as affecting, to some extent, the ability of the college supervisor to grasp the elements of each student teaching situation.

The number of students assigned to the college supervisor does not affect his ability to understand the student teaching situation in general, to maintain a realistic picture of the public school problems, or to understand the purposes and objectives of the schools. These conclusions may reflect more the selection of college supervisors with a high degree of professional training and experience in the field of education; evidently, a highly trained college supervisor with a wealth of training and experience in many areas of education aids a great deal in overcoming program deficiencies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study examined two programs of student teaching supervision in an effort to determine the effect of the size of the student teaching group on the supervisory program.

Two small groups of student teachers (17 and 20) were compared with a large group of students (31) on their responses to a questionnaire. Their supervising teachers were also compared on a similar questionnaire. The two small groups made up the control group and were found to be similar populations and treated as such. The experimental group consisted of the large group of students and teachers (N=31).

Two college professors were assigned to the study. Professor X conducted the experimental program in the fall of 1973 and one control program in the winter (1973-74) quarter. The other professor (Y) conducted one of the control programs in the fall quarter of 1973 at the same time as the experimental program.

The students, college supervisors, and supervising teachers were those normally assigned in the regular placement process.

The two programs were necessarily different. The experimental program placed more emphasis on small group and large group meetings with the students and teachers and involved extra written reporting. The experimental program also included a greater "clustering" of student teachers in any one school. The role of the experimental college supervisor was viewed more as a troubleshooter and greater responsibility was placed upon the supervising teacher.

After the data from the questionnaires had been converted into numerical scores and tabulated; "t" scores were obtained for determining if any significant differences existed between the control and experimental groups in their responses.

When total responses of the experimental and control groups of teachers were examined it was found that 35 percent of the responses provided significant differences and 65 percent of the responses did not. With the student groups it was found that 44.5 percent of the responses provided significant differences and 55.5 percent did not.

It was found that the large group program was affected to some extent by the lack of classroom observation and the individual types of contacts which were possible in the smaller group programs. However, classroom observation by the college supervisor did not appear as important a factor as many have believed. Teachers and students indicated aneed for more contacts but in forms other than classroom observation.

There seemed to be little problem in the availability of the college supervisor and students and teachers indicated confidence in his being available when help was needed. In spite of this aspect, the ability of the college supervisor to make adequate evaluations, to be effective in conferences, and to write fair and accurate evaluations was affected by the amount of intensive observations that could be made in the classroom situation. Although teachers and students play down the importance of classroom observations, their other responses indicate that without it, the college supervisor loses his effectiveness. It is interesting that the link between these areas is not obvious to them.

The college supervisors in both programs received very high ratings from both the students and teachers in their competency, helpfulness, personal relations, honesty, and ability to work with others. These high ratings reflect the high degree of training and experience of the college supervisors rather than specific aspects of the programs. Nevertheless, training, experience, and an ability to work with people are valuable characteristics of a college supervisor and no doubt contribute to the success of programs.

There still needs to be a considerable amount of work in helping student teachers to plan for teaching and to help them and the supervising teachers to realize the value of planning.

Evaluation of the student teaching performance is another area in which students are particularly critical of the teachers and the college supervisors. Both groups of students gave supervising teachers a better rating in "evaluating student teaching performance" than they did the college supervisors. This is an area where the roles of the teachers and supervisors need to be examined. There is no doubt that the day by day contact which the supervising teacher has with the student teacher makes it possible for the teacher to do a much better job of evaluation than is possible for the college supervisor.

The teachers appear willing to take on more responsibility for the supervision of the student teacher, but there seems to be some reservations. They appear to accept this responsibility if guidance and in-service approaches are provided.

There is an overwhelming support from the students for the present program of student teaching, but the other pre-student teaching professional education courses did not fare as well.

At times, teachers and students appeared to respond more to the expectations of the program as it was perceived by the college supervisor than to their own views. Teachers and students are willing to accept whatever role is assigned to them as long as they feel that there is continued and positive support from the representatives of the teacher education institution.

The expertise of the supervising teacher and the college supervisor are not being utilized to the fullest extent. There is recognition that each may be doing what the other might do better. There appears to be some duplication of roles by the supervising teacher and the college supervisor. There needs to be an in-depth look at these roles and a better definition of the roles of all persons in the student teaching program.

Although significant differences occurred between the two programs, neither program gave evidence of any overwhelmingly negative elements. The effectiveness of the college supervisor in the experimental program was affected to some extent by the larger number of students. Yet, the larger group program did not produce any evidence that the progress of the student teachers in that program was affected in a negative manner. Both programs appeared to give adequate supervision and guidance to the student teachers.

There is no doubt that many alternative programs are feasible and that large group programs can be successful. There does need to be a great deal of attention in any program to the interaction of the persons involved, maintenance of positive attitudes, a better definition of the roles of the persons in the team, and much more emphasis on the role of in-service education.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Teacher and/or Administrator:

Occasionally we ask school personnel to provide feed-back concerning their opinion of the supervisory performance of the university supervisor who visits their schools. Would you please complete the following form and return it to the address listed below:

Dr. Dennis Redburn
Coordinator of Student Teaching
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Quarter_____ University Supervisor's Name_____
Elementary (Grade)_____ Secondary (Subject)_____
Approximate Distance from Ball State_____ Miles
Years of Experience_____ Degree Held_____
Position: Teacher_____ Number of student teachers you have worked with
Administrator_____ before this one_____.
Other_____

Following each question you will note a series of letters which represent possible answers. The meanings of these letters are as follows: A-Agree, PA-Probably Agree, U/NA-Undecided or Not applicable, PD-Probably Disagree, D-Disagree.

Question	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
1. The student felt that by revealing weaknesses to his university supervisor, he was endangering his student teaching grade.					
2. The university supervisor was not readily accessible when the student needed to contact him.					
3. The supervising teacher and the university supervisor worked well together.					
4. The student had an opportunity to meet with his university supervisor on an individual basis before or after he was observed in a teaching situation.					
5. The purposes and objectives of the school in which the student taught were understood by the university supervisor.					

Question	A	PA	U/PA	PD	D
6. The university supervisor demonstrated a familiarity with different methods of teaching.					
7. The student's personality conflicted with that of the university supervisor.					
8. The student had confidence in his university supervisor's ability.					
9. The student teaching assignment did not live up to the student's expectations of a desirable and professionally rewarding situation.					
10. Considering the circumstances, the student felt at ease when his university supervisor observed his teaching.					
11. The university supervisor was not candid enough to be of real help to the student.					
12. The university supervisor encouraged the student to experiment with various teaching methods.					
13. The lesson planning required by the university supervisor contributed to better teaching on the part of the student.					
14. The university supervisor was enjoyable to work with.					
15. The university supervisor did not seem to understand the difficulties that the student faced in student teaching.					
16. The university supervisor used constructive criticism when conferring with the student teacher about his teaching.					
17. The university supervisor was not particularly helpful in our individual conferences.					
18. The university supervisor seemed to grasp the elements of the student teaching situation which made it unique.					
19. The university supervisor did not provide the student the freedom in planning that he desired.					

Question	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
20. In the discussions, the university supervisor's appraisal of the student's teaching strengths and weaknesses seemed fair and reasonable.					
21. The university supervisor was effective in his relationship with me.					
22. The university supervisor answered my questions specifically and to the point.					
23. I felt that I could discuss professional problems frankly and openly with the university supervisor.					
24. The university supervisor did not seem to have a realistic picture of the daily problems of the public schools.					
25. The university supervisor did not seem to try to make the student feel comfortable while he observed the student's teaching.					
26. The university supervisor did not particularly seem interested in the student and his problems.					
27. The university supervisor seemed to have excellent rapport.					
28. The university supervisor seemed to have excellent public relations skills.					
29. We would be happy to have the university supervisor continue to supervise in our schools.					
30. The university supervisor made every effort to make the student teaching experience work smoothly and sucessfully for all involved.					

31. My overall rating of the university supervisor is as follows:

One of the best we have worked with	As good as any we have worked with	One of the poorest we have worked with

QUESTION	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
32. The college supervisor made a sufficient number of visits to our school.					
33. The college supervisor should concentrate his efforts on developing the competencies of the supervising teacher and let the supervising teacher take complete responsibility for the student teacher.					
34. The college supervisor is much more valuable when he works with in-service approaches and lets the supervising teacher take most of the responsibility for the student teacher's progress.					
35. The supervisory approach used by the college supervisor enabled him to adequately evaluate the performance of the student teacher.					
36. The use of individual conferences and group meetings (out of school), eliminates the necessity for school visits by the college supervisor except where problems have occurred.					
37. The college supervisor should concentrate his efforts toward helping the student teacher rather than the supervising teacher.					
38. The college supervisor had sufficient contacts with the student teacher.					
39. A competent supervising teacher eliminates the necessity of classroom visits by the college supervisor.					
40. The college supervisor had sufficient contacts with the supervising teacher.					

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

v

STUDENT EVALUATION

Quarter_____ Supervisor's Name _____

Elementary (grade)___ Secondary (subject) _____

Your age _____ Sex _____

Marital status_____ Approx. grade point average_____

Following each question you will note a series of letters which represent possible answers. The meanings of these letters are as follows: A=Agree, PA=Probably Agree, U/NA=Undecided or Not Applicable, PD=Probably Disagree, D=Disagree.

Question	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
1. My participation course was beneficial to my student teaching.					
2. I felt that by revealing weaknesses to my college supervisor, I was endangering my student teaching grade.					
3. Student teaching gave me a great deal of personal satisfaction.					
4. My college supervisor was not readily accessible when I needed to contact him.					
5. My supervising teacher and college supervisor worked well together.					
6. My mid-quarter group conferences with my college supervisor were not of much benefit to me as a student teacher.					
7. I am glad that I had an opportunity to meet with my university supervisor on an individual basis before he observed my teaching.					
8. The purposes and objectives of the school in which I taught cannot be achieved by its curriculum.					

Question	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
9. It was not particularly important to me that my college supervisor be a specialist in my particular teaching field.					
10. My college supervisor demonstrated a familiarity with different methods of teaching.					
11. My personality conflicted with that of my college supervisor.					
12. I had confidence in my college supervisor's ability.					
13. My student teaching assignment did not live up to my expectations of a desirable and professionally rewarding situation.					
14. Considering the circumstances, I felt at ease when my college supervisor observed my teaching.					
15. My college supervisor was not candid enough to be a real help to me.					
16. My college supervisor permitted me to experiment with my teaching methods.					
17. My 420 course was not especially beneficial to my student teaching.					
18. The lesson planning required by my college supervisor contributed to better teaching on my part.					
19. My college supervisor was enjoyable to work with.					
20. My college supervisor did not seem to understand the difficulties I faced in student teaching.					
21. My methods course was not especially beneficial to my student teaching.					
22. My college supervisor used constructive criticism when conferring with me about my teaching.					

Question	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
23. My college supervisor was not particularly helpful in our individual conferences.					
24. My primary reason for requesting the student teaching assignment which I accepted was economic or personal.					
25. My college supervisor seemed to grasp the elements of my student teaching situation which made it unique.					
26. My college supervisor did not provide the freedom in planning that I desired.					
27. In our discussions, the college supervisor's appraisal of my teaching strengths and weaknesses has seemed fair and reasonable.					
28. My college supervisor was effective in his relationship with me.					
29. My college supervisor answered my questions specifically and to the point.					
30. I felt that I could discuss my most serious professional problems frankly and openly with my college supervisor.					
31. My college supervisor did not seem to have a realistic picture of the daily problems of the public schools.					
32. My college supervisor did not seem to try to make me feel comfortable while he observed my teaching.					
33. To get a superior student teaching experience, I would have been willing to move to a community far from home.					
34. My college supervisor did not seem particularly interested in me and my problems.					
35. If I could plan my career again, I would not choose teaching.					

QUESTION	A	PA	U/NA	PD	D
36. The supervisory approach used by the college supervisor enabled him to adequately evaluate my student teaching performance.					
37. The college supervisor made sufficient contacts with my supervising teacher.					
38. The college supervisor can evaluate my student teaching performance better than my supervising teacher.					
39. The observation of the student teacher by the supervising teacher is all that is necessary for adequate evaluation of the student teacher.					
40. The college supervisor's observations of the student teacher's classroom performance is necessary for adequate evaluation of the student teacher.					
41. My supervising teacher has adequate information about my student teaching performance to write a fair and accurate recommendation.					
42. My supervising teacher can evaluate my performance better than my college supervisor.					
43. The supervisory process used by the college supervisor eliminates the necessity for his visitation to the student teacher's classroom.					
44. My college supervisor has adequate information about my student teaching performance to write a fair and accurate recommendation.					
45. The college supervisor made sufficient contacts with me.					